IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA BRYSON CITY DIVISION

CRIMINAL NO. 2:00CR90-1

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)	
VS.)	<u>DRDER</u>
MICHAEL WAYNE BILLS))	

THIS MATTER is before the Court on the Defendant's motion to temporarily suspend his restitution payments. The motion is denied.

The Defendant's restitution payments were ordered in his Judgment of Conviction in a Criminal Case to be made through the Inmate Financial Responsibility Program.¹ The authority and method of collection through this program as well as a determination of the Defendant's ability to pay has been delegated to the Bureau of Prisons (BOP) by federal regulations.

28 C.F.R. §§ 545.10-545.16. Defendant, who requests a temporary suspension of payments, is obligated to exhaust all administrative

¹The Defendant notes in his motion that his co-defendant has not paid any amount toward restitution. However, the co-defendant was not ordered to pay any restitution.

remedies through the BOP before approaching the appropriate district court. *Aja v. Bureau of Prisons Staff*, 202 F.3d 267 (table), 1999 WL 1336093 (6th Cir. 1999); *United States v. Rumney*, 86 F.3d 1147 (table), 1996 WL 325485 (1st Cir. 1996); *Indelicato v. Suarez*, 207 F.Supp.2d 216 (S.D.N.Y. 2002).

In addition, it is not unconstitutional to condition the right to work to an agreement that BOP will garnish a portion of the inmate's earnings for payment toward fines, assessments and/or restitution. *James v. Quinlan*, 866 F.2d 627 (3d Cir. 1989). Indeed, such payments may be collected from non-wage funds contained within a prisoner's inmate account. *Moreno v. Hood*, 10 Fed. Appx. 600 (9th Cir. 2001).

IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED that the Defendant's motion is hereby **DENIED**.

Signed: January 11, 2006

Lacy H. Thornburg United States District Judge